UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,232	09/20/2001	Kuansan Wang	M61.12-0389	5870

27366	7590	07/12/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O WESTMAN
CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400 - INTERNATIONAL CENTRE
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER
SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/960,232	WANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *2-7,10-13,31-33 and 35* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,8,9,14-30,34 and 36-39* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *1* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 June 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed 6/10/2005. Claims 1, 8, 9,

14, 20, 24, 26, and 34 are amended. Claims 2-7, 10-13, 19, 31-33, and 35 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 26, and 34 have been considered but are

moot since new grounds of rejection have been presented below. Accordingly, this action is non-

final.

Oath/Declaration

3.   Examiner has withdrawn the objections to the oath/declaration since, pursuant to 37 CFR

1.76(d)(4), it is office policy to capture bibliographic information from the application data sheet.

Applicant's latest application data sheet, filed 9/4/2002, contains the correct filing date of 5/4/2001

for provisional application number 60/289,041.

Drawings

4.   Examiner has withdrawn some of the objections to the drawings since Applicant's

amendments have overcome some objections. However, the following objection still applies:

5.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do

not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 301 and 305. Corrected

drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all

of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6.   Examiner has withdrawn the objections to the specification since Applicant's amendments have overcome the objections.

Claim Objections

7.   Examiner has withdrawn the objection to claim 24 since Applicant's amendment has overcome the objection. The objection to claim 26 and the new objections listed below still apply.

8.   Claim 1 is objected to because "the recognition server" in line 21 in not introduced until line 25. Examiner suggests "a recognition server" in line 21 and "the recognition server" in line 25. Appropriate correction is required.

9.   Claims 20-21 are objected to because claim 12 has been cancelled. Examiner suggests amending the claims to depend from claim 1 and will treat the claims as such. Appropriate correction is required.

10.   Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informality: "inputted to at at least one of the client and the web server". Examiner suggests "inputted to at least one of the client and the web server". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11.   Examiner has withdrawn the claim rejections under 35 USC § 112 since Applicant's

amendments have overcome the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

13.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barclay et al. (U.S.

5,960,399, hereinafter "Barclay") in view of Brown et al. (U.S. 6,587,822, hereinafter "Brown").

14.   <u>With respect to claim 1</u>, Barclay discloses a server/client system for processing data, the

system comprising:

      o   a network comprising:

            o   a web server having information accessible remotely (fig. 4 #(80, 82));

            o   a client device having a rendering device to indicate fields to be entered (fig. 4 #70, col. 9

                  lines 2-5), the client device configured to record input data associated with each of the

                  fields upon an indication by the user of which field subsequent input is intended for

                  (necessary to perform function discussed in col. 9 lines 2-5), and wherein the client

                  device is adapted to send the input data to a remote location (col. 5 lines 36-64); and

o   a recognition server configured to receive the input data and return data indicative of

what was recognized to at least one of the client and the web server (fig. 4 #80, col. 5

line 65 – col. 6 line 19).

15.   Barclay does not disclose a second client device having a microphone and a speaker, the

second client device configured to record speech data associated with each of a set of fields in

response to prompts given to the user, and wherein the second client device is adapted to send the

speech data to the recognition server, wherein the second client device comprises a telephone and a

voice browser capable of rendering the information from the web server.

16.   Nonetheless, using such a client device to access a web server was well known, as evidenced

by Brown. In a similar art, Brown discloses a client device (fig. 1 #108) having a microphone and a

speaker (col. 3 lines 10-13), the client device configured to record speech data associated with each

of a set of fields (col. 5 lines 49-59) in response to prompts given to a user (col. 5 lines 7-17), and

wherein the client device comprises a telephone (col. 3 lines 10-13) and a voice browser capable or

rendering information from a web server (col. 5 lines 7-17).

17.   Given the teachings of Brown, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to use the telephone (taught by Brown) to login to server 80 (taught by Barclay) to perform speech

recognition (respond to the prompts etc.). The motivation for doing so would have been to extend

use of the system (taught by Barclay) to users equipped with only a telephone (Brown col. 1 lines 20-

23).

18.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barclay et al. in view

of Brown.

19.   With respect to claim 26, Barclay discloses a server/client system for processing data, the

system comprising:

- o   a network comprising:

    - o   a web server having information accessible remotely (fig. 4 #(80, 82));

    - o   a client device having a microphone (necessary to record speech) and a rendering

        component (fig. 4 #78), the client device configured to obtain the information from the

        web server (fig. 4 "HTTP Connection"), the information having corresponding fields

        (col. 9 lines 2-5), the client device further configured to record input data associated with

        each of the fields (col. 9 lines 2-5), and wherein the client device is adapted to send the

        input data to a remote location (col. 5 lines 36-64) with an indication of a grammar to

        use for input recognition (col. 8 lines 26-28); and

    - o   a recognition server remote from the input data configured to receive the input data and

        the indication of the grammar (fig. 4 #80), the recognition server returning data

        indicative of what was inputted to at least one of the client and the web server (col. 5 line

        65 – col. 6 line 19).

20.   Barclay does not teach or suggest the client device comprising a telephone and the rendering

component comprising a speaker.

21.   Nonetheless, using a client device comprising a telephone and a speaker to access a web

server was well known, as evidenced by Brown. In a similar art, Brown discloses using a client device

(fig. 1 #108) comprising a telephone and a speaker (col. 3 lines 10-13) to access a web server (fig. 1

#106, col. 2 line 61 – col. 3 line 2).

22.   Given the teachings of Brown, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to use the telephone (taught by Brown) to login to server 80 (taught by Barclay) to perform speech

recognition (respond to the prompts, indicate the grammar etc. as taught by Barclay). The

motivation for doing so would have been to extend use of the system (taught by Barclay) to users

equipped with only a telephone (Brown col. 1 lines 20-23).

23.   Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barclay in view of

Brown.

24.   <u>With respect to claim 34</u>, Barclay discloses a method for processing voice recognition in a

client/server system comprising:

   o   transmitting from a web server (fig. 4 #(80, 82)) to a client device (fig. 4 #70) a markup

       language page having extensions configured to obtain input data from a user of the client

       device (col. 8 lines 48-51);

   o   rendering the markup language page on the client device (col. 8 lines 52-56);

   o   obtaining input data as a function of input from the user (col. 8 lines 56-58);

   o   transmitting the input data (col. 5 lines 36-64) and an indication of an associated grammar

       (col. 8 lines 26-28) to a recognition server remote from the client device (fig. 4 #80); and

   o   receiving a recognition result from the recognition server indicative of what was inputted at

       at least one of the client device and web server (col. 5 line 65 – col. 6 line 19).

25.   Barclay does not disclose the client device comprising a telephone or rendering the markup

language page on the client device through a speaker.

26.   Nonetheless, using such a client device to access a web server was well known, as evidenced

by Brown. In a similar art, Brown discloses a client device (fig. 1 #108) having a microphone and a

speaker (col. 3 lines 10-13), the client device configured to record speech data associated with each

of a set of fields (col. 5 lines 49-59) in response to prompts given to a user (col. 5 lines 7-17), and

wherein the client device comprises a telephone (col. 3 lines 10-13) and a voice browser capable or rendering information from a web server (col. 5 lines 7-17).

27.   Given the teachings of Brown, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the telephone (taught by Brown) to login to server 80 (taught by Barclay) to the perform speech recognition (obtain the input data by responding to prompts etc.). The motivation for doing so would have been to extend use of the system (taught by Barclay) to users equipped with only a telephone (Brown col. 1 lines 20-23).

28.   Claim 2, 9, 14, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barclay in view of Brown.

29.   With respect to claim 2, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim 1. Barclay further discloses the information received from the web server and provided to the client device being a markup language (col. 8 lines 37-47).

30.   With respect to claim 9, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim 1. Barclay further discloses the client adapted to normalize the input data prior to sending the input data to the remote server (col. 5 lines 2-10).

31.   With respect to claim 14, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim 1. Barclay further discloses that the information received from the web server and provided to the client devices is a markup language (col. 8 lines 42-47).

32.   With respect to claim 20, Barclay-Brown teaches teaches the server/client system for processing data applied to claim 1. Barclay further discloses the server/client system wherein the

client is adapted to normalize the input data prior to sending the input data to the remote server

(col. 5 lines 2-10).

33.   With respect to claim 25, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system for processing data

applied to claim 1. Barclay further discloses said server/client system for processing data wherein the

web server and the recognition server are located on a single machine (fig. 4 #80).

34.   Claims 8 and 15 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown, and further in

view of *SCRIPT – Client-side Script*, Web Design Group, May 13th, 1998 hereinafter referred to as

Client-side Script.

35.   With respect to claim 15, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

14. Barclay further discloses the server/client system wherein the markup language received by the

client comprises one or several markup portions (col. 8 lines 42-47), however Barclay does not

expressly disclose the markup language comprising one or several script portions. Nonetheless, a

markup language comprising one several script portions is well known, as evidenced by Client-side

Script.

36.   In a similar art, Client-side Script discloses a markup language comprising one or several

script portions (p. 1 "The SCRIPT element includes a client-side script in the document."). Given

the teachings of Client-side Script it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

to modify the client/server system to use a markup language comprising one of several markup

portions as well as one or several script portions - obtaining the invention specified in claim 15. The

motivation for doing so would have been to allow greater interactivity in a document by responding

to user events (Client-side Script p. 1 "Client-side script allow greater interactivity in a document by

responding to user events.").

37.   With respect to claim 8, Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script teaches the server/client system

applied to claim 15. Barclay further discloses the markup language comprising one of HTML,

XHTML, cHTML, XML, and WML (col. 8 lines 42-47).

38.   Claims 16 and 17 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown, further in

view of Client-side Script, and further in view of Jochumson (U.S. 6,453,290).

39.   With respect to claim 16, Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script teaches the server/client system

applied to claim 15. Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script does not expressly teach the server/client

system wherein the markup language includes an indication associating a grammar with a field, the

indication having the same form from each of the client devices. Nonetheless, providing an

indication associating a grammar with a field was well known, as evidenced by Jochumson.

40.   In a similar art, Jochumson discloses a method and system for network based speech

recognition wherein a user selected a speech exercise on a web page and is provided an associating

grammar reference (col. 4 lines 43-46). Given the teachings of Jochumson it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the server/client system applied to claim 15

by including an indication associating a grammar with each field, the indication having the same

form for each of the client devices. The motivation for doing so would have been so that a client

device is aware of the grammar associated with each field and can therefore transfer this information

along with the input data so that the recognition server is aware of the grammar associated with each

field.

41.   With respect to claim 17, Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script-Jochumson teaches the

server/client system applied to claim 16. Barclay further discloses the recognition server receiving

the input data and the indication of the grammar (col. 8 lines 26-28).

42.   Claim 18 is rejected as being obvious over Barclay.in view of Brown, further in view of

Client-side Script, further in view of Jochumson, and further in view of Dragosh et al. (U.S.

6,366,886, hereinafter "Dragosh").

43.   With respect to claim 18, Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script-Jochumson teaches the

server/client system applied to claim 17. Barclay-Brown-Client-side Script-Jochumson does not

teach the server/client system wherein the grammar is stored on the client device and transferred to

the recognition server with the input data. Nonetheless, transferring grammar stored on a client

device to a recognition server along with input data is well known, as evidenced by Dragosh.

44.   In a similar art, Dragosh discloses a system for providing speech recognition services

wherein a grammar is stored on a client device and transferred to a recognition server with input

data (Abstract line 6-10, col. 2 lines 18-24). Given the teachings of Dragosh it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the server/client system applied to claim 17

by transferring the grammar to the recognition server along with the input data - obtaining the

invention as specified by claim 18. The motivation for doing so would have been so that if the

recognition server doesn't have a specific grammar on file then the user is able to supply the

grammar to the recognition server so that the recognition server can process the input data

appropriately.

45.   Claims 21-23 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown, and further in

view of *XML and XSL from servers to cell-phones*, Ramin Firoozye and Ranbir Chawla, September 2nd,

1998 hereinafter referred to as Firoozye.

46.   With respect to claim 21, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

12. Barclay-Brown does not expressly teach the server/client system wherein the web server includes

a server side plug-in module for dynamically generating markup language for each of the client

devices. Nonetheless, a server side plug-in module that dynamically generates markup language for

each client device is well known, as evidenced by Firoozye.

47.   In a similar art, Firoozye discloses a server side plug-in module for dynamically generating

markup language for client devices (fig. 2, p. 3 "HTML code dynamically generated via an

application server"). Given the teachings of Firoozye it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the server/client system by including a server side plug-in module

for dynamically generating markup language for each of the client devices as taught by Firoozye. The

motivation for doing so would have been to provide a way to create dynamically generated content

for a client.

48.   With respect to claim 22, Barclay-Brown-Firoozye teaches the server/client system applied

to claim 21. Firoozye further discloses the server side plug-in module dynamically generating markup

language as a function of the type of client device (p. 3 "Today, through XML and XSL

technologies, the HTML can be generated on-the-fly, with the added benefit that the flavor of

display markup can be chosen at runtime", fig. 3).

49.   With respect to claim 23, Barclay-Brown-Firoozye teaches the server/client system applied

to claim 22. It would have been necessary for the server side plug-in disclosed by Firoozye to detect

the type of client device in order to perform the function disclosed in fig. 3 and discussed in the

above rejection of claim 22.

50.   Claim 24 is rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown, further in view of

Firoozye, and further in view of Thelen et al. (U.S. 6,526,380 hereinafter Thelen).

51.   <u>With respect to claim 24</u>, over Barclay-Brown-Firoozye teaches the server/client system

applied to claim 21. Barclay-Brown-Firoozye does not expressly teach the web server including a

plurality of dialog modules accessible by the server side plug-in module, each dialog module

pertaining to obtaining data using speech recognition, the server side plug-in module generating the

markup language as a function of a dialog module.

52.   In a similar art, Thelen discloses a speech recognition system having a server (fig. 3 #300)

including a plurality of dialog modules accessible by a server side plug-in module (fig. 3 #350), each

module pertaining to obtaining data using speech recognition (fig. 3 #(331, 332, 333)), the server

side plug-in module generating the markup language as a function of a dialog module (col. 7 lines

50-52). Given the teachings of Thelen it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to design the web server of the server/client system to include a plurality of dialog modules

accessible by the server side plug-in as taught by Thelen to obtain the invention specified in claim

24. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a recognition system that is better

capable of dealing with huge vocabularies (Thelen col. 1 lines 53-55).

53.   Claims 27-28 and 30 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay, and further in view of

Brown.

54.   <u>With respect to claim 27</u>, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

26. Barclay further discloses the server/client system wherein the information received from the web

server and applied to the client device is a markup language (col. 8 lines 37-47).

55.   With respect to claim 28, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

27. Barclay further discloses the server/client system wherein markup language comprises one of

HTML, XHTML, cHTML, XML and WML (col. 8 lines 37-47).

56.   With respect to claim 30, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

26. Barclay further discloses the server/client system wherein the grammar is stored on the

recognition server (col. 4 lines 18-22) and wherein the indication of the grammar includes a

reference to the grammar for the recognition server (col. 8 lines 26-28).

57.   Claim 29 is rejected as being obvious over Barclay, further in view of Brown, and further in

view of Dragosh.

58.   With respect to claim 29, Barclay-Brown teaches the server/client system applied to claim

26. Barclay-Brown does not teach the server/client system wherein the grammar is stored on the

client device and transferred to the recognition server with the input data. Nonetheless, transferring

grammar stored on a client device to a recognition server along with input data is well known, as

evidenced by Dragosh.

59.   In a similar art, Dragosh discloses a system for providing speech recognition services

wherein a grammar is stored on a client device and transferred to a recognition server with input

data (Abstract lines 6-10, col. 2 lines 18-24). Given the teachings of Dragosh it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the server/client system by supplying the

grammar along with the input data. The motivation for doing so would have been so that if the

recognition server doesn't have a specific grammar then the user is able to supply the grammar to

the recognition server.

60.   Claims 36-37 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown.

61.   <u>With respect to claim 36</u>, Barclay-Brown teaches the method for processing voice recognition applied to claim 34. Brown further discloses that rendering the markup language includes audibly prompting the user (col. 5 lines 7-17).

62.   <u>With respect to claim 37</u>, Barclay discloses the method for processing voice recognition applied to claim 34. Barclay further discloses the method for processing voice recognition wherein the markup language comprises one of HTML, XHTML, cHTML, XML and WML (col. 4 lines 37-47).

63.   Claims 38-39 are rejected as being obvious over Barclay in view of Brown, and further in view of Dragosh.

64.   <u>With respect to claim 38</u>, Barclay-Brown teaches the method for processing voice recognition applied to claim 34. Barclay does not disclose the method for processing voice recognition wherein transmitting the indication of the grammar comprises transmitting the grammar. Nonetheless, transferring grammar stored on a client device to a recognition server along with input data is well known, as evidenced by Dragosh.

65.   In a similar art, Dragosh discloses a method for providing speech recognition services wherein a grammar is stored on a client device and transferred to a recognition server with input data (Abstract lines 6-10, col. 2 lines 18-24). Given the teachings of Dragosh it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method for processing voice recognition by transmitting the grammar along with the input data to the recognition server – obtaining the invention specified by claim 38. The motivation for doing so would have been so that

if the recognition server doesn't have a certain grammar then the user is able to supply the grammar

to the recognition server.

66.   <u>With respect to claim 39</u>, Barclay-Brown teaches the method for processing voice

recognition applied to claim 34. Barclay does not expressly disclose the method for processing voice

recognition wherein transmitting the indication of the grammar comprises transmitting a reference

to the recognition server as to where the grammar is located. Nonetheless, transmitting a grammar

reference location is well known, as evidenced by Jochumnson.

67.   In a similar art, Jochumnson discloses a method for speech recognition wherein a client

transmits an indication of a grammar comprising a reference to a recognition server as to where the

grammar is located (col. 10 line 65 – col. 11 line 17). Given the teachings of Jochumnson it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method for processing voice

recognition by transmitting a reference to the recognition server as to where the grammar is located.

The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the appropriate grammar to the

recognition server so that the input data is processed correctly.

Conclusion

68.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

69.   It light of the specification (p. 7 lines 17-24), it appears that, in contrast to the art applied to

the independent claims, the "client device" and the "second client device" of claim 1 are meant to be

physically located at the same location on the network.

70.   Applicant is advised that Wang et al. (U.S. 2002/0003547) may provide motivation for

making such a modification (see title).

71.   Applicant is advised that Brocious et al. (U.S. 6,745,163) may provide motivation for making such a modification (see fig. 3).

72.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

73.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

74.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100